

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 10-19 are currently pending in the present application. Claims 10, 14 and 18 have been amended. Pending claims 10-13 and 15-19 are rejected. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Applicant notes with appreciation the acknowledgment of the claim for foreign priority and the acknowledgment that all certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

II. Objection to Claim 14

The Examiner objected to claim 14 as depending upon a rejected base claim, but the Examiner indicated that claim 14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, Applicant has amended claim 14 to incorporate the limitations of parent claim 10. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 14 is in allowable condition.

III. Rejection of Claims 10-13 and 15-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 10-13 and 15-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,108,631 ("Rühl"). As an initial matter, Applicant notes that claim 18 has been amended to recite the allowable subject matter contained in claim 14. Accordingly, claim 18 and its dependent claim 19 are similarly believed to be in allowable condition for the reasons stated by the Examiner in connection with claim 14 on page 5 of the Office Action. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that Rühl does not anticipate the pending claims 10-13 and 15-17 for the following reasons.

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), a single prior art reference must identically disclose each and every claim feature. See Lindeman Maschinenfabrik v. American Hoist and Derrick, 730 F.2d 1452, 1458 (Fed. Cir. 1984). If any claim feature is absent from a prior art reference, it cannot anticipate the claim. See Rowe v. Dror, 112 F.3d 473, 478 (Fed. Cir. 1997). To the extent that the Examiner may be relying on the doctrine of inherent disclosure for the rejection, the Examiner must provide a "basis in fact and/or

technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristics necessarily flow from the teachings of the applied art.” (See M.P.E.P. § 2112; emphasis in original; see also Ex parte Levy, 17 U.S.P.Q.2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990)).

Amended claim 10 recites, in relevant parts, “wherein the input unit enables entry of characters by a user, and wherein **after the user enters at least one character as a partial entry of a name**, the display unit displays as a **selection suggestion a first name beginning with the at least one character**, and wherein if the user does not indicate an acceptance of the first name, the input unit enables the user to input at least one further character, and in response to the input of the at least one further character the display unit displays as a selection suggestion a second name beginning with the at least one character and the at least one further character.” These amended features are clearly described in the original Specification, e.g., p. 6, l. 21 – p. 7, l. 2.

Applicant notes that the above-recited claimed features are clearly not taught or suggested by Rühl. In contrast to the claimed invention, in the arrangement of Rühl a suggestion for an input is only displayed after the input of a name has been completely finished and after a search of the data storage unit for this input has not led to a unique match result. Instead of teaching an output of a selection suggestion based on a partially-entered name, Rühl clearly leads away from the present invention by providing that, only after the termination of an input, and after it has been determined that input does not result in a unique match result, the user is supplied with a list of multiple locations from which the user may select a location.


Independent of the above, Rühl clearly does not teach or suggest that “a **selectable name [is] displayed as a suggestion on the display unit as a function of a specified sorting criterion** for the stored names of a category and as a function of earlier entries for the selection of the name to be entered, wherein **a selection probability of the names is used as a sorting criterion** in the control unit.” According to Rühl, the selection probability is taken into consideration for searching through the data storage unit for the completed input name, but the selection probability is simply not considered for providing the suggestion list after it has been determined that input does not result in a unique result.

For the foregoing reasons, claim 10 and its dependent claims 11-13 and 15-17 are not anticipated by Rühl. Withdrawal of the anticipation rejection based on Rühl is therefore respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims 10-19 are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

 (R. No. 36,197)

Dated: August 11, 2006

By: JONG LEE for Gerard Messina
Gerard A. Messina
Reg. No. 35,952

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO 26646